











# THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

(An indictment of the policy and conduct of the Prime Minister of India)

*By*

**BYOMKESH BANERJEE**

*F O R E W O R D*

*by*

**Sri Hemendra Prasad Ghose**

**FIRST EDITION 1950**

**PRICE ONE RUPEE**

**Printed at the City Printing Works 7, Basanta Bose Road,  
Calcutta-26 and Published by Moni Bagchee from the Daily  
News Digest Office, 28/24, Radha Bazar Street, Calcutta-1**

# Foreword

“Step by step we rose to greatness—  
Thro’ the toungesters we may fall.”

SRI Byomkesh Banerjee, Founder and Chairman of the Board of Editors of the *Daily News Digest*, has prepared an indictment of the political policy of the present Premier of the Indian Dominion.

“Life,” said Mazzinee, “is a mission ; its end is not the search after happiness, but knowledge and fulfilment of duty.” The writer has tried to judge the Premier according to this criterion, and according to him, found the Premier wanting.

On May 21 last the Prime Minister said at New Delhi : “I am surprised why some people long to be Ministers. I do not know a job more difficult or troublesome. This is a prison house — a bed of thorns.” And he must not blame people if they feel surprised at his vice-like grip on the post he occupies and ask what makes him remain in the prison house — lie on the bed of thorns when it is open to him to go out. His faith in the Indo-Pakistan Agreement has been a disappointment and a surprise and his attempts to



support it pathetic. And the bang of his Laputan big drum is perhaps best heard in the sesquipedaliac sentences of his latest gaseous speech on the Agreement. The Agreement has made more than one member of the Cabinet resign from his Government because they actually found it a prison house — a bed of thorns. And lest the rest of his colleagues would prove a bruised reed to lean upon, he has induced C. R. who had been “half-willing to be pressed” to come and stand by him from his retirement — perhaps because he is the man who first proposed to throw Bengal and the Punjab to the wolves to secure power in the rest of India — a proposal which was resented at the time by Gandhiji and Pandit Nehru who had been hovering round him.

In his speech at the farewell party to two Ministers — Dr. John Matthai and Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram, the Prime Minister has practically put a premium on inefficiency and failure by ridiculing the expectations of the people : “It is after all not possible for the Rehabilitation Ministry to build overnight houses for thousands of people or for the Food Ministry to produce food for everybody in the country within such a time.”

But it is not a case of accomplishing these performances overnight. More than two years have elapsed since the problem of rehabilitation

and augmentation of food supply confronted the Government of India of which Pandit Nehru was and continues to be the head. Had necessary schemes been prepared and efficiently given effect to surely the harrowing scenes of children being born and people dying on the railway station platform in Calcutta would have been avoided and the gap between food produced and food required bridged. The Premier started with the idea that the Hindus of East Bengal would not and must not leave Pakistan ; he said so at Calcutta when he declined to grant an interview to representatives of refugees ; he was chary to face the reality of the refugee problem and profit by experience. Hence no proper scheme of rehabilitation was prepared in time.

As for solving the shortage of food in India which is an agricultural country we would cite the achievement of those in authority in Great Britain —during the Global War—in augmenting food production. According to the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture in 1943 Britain could expand food production since the war by about 70 per cent by weight of all the total supplies compared with a little more than one-third before war. What Britain —a predominantly industrial country—with all her disadvantages had been able to achieve can surely be done in

India which is an agricultural country, if only the the Government set about it in the right way.

Here is an example of failure of which the Premier should be ashamed. The Premier seems to have developed the characteristics of a megalomaniac and is impatient of criticism. But he ought to remember what Milton said : "When complaints are fully heard, deeply considered and speedily reformed, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty obtained that wise men look for."

One may or may not agree with all that the author says. But it cannot be gainsaid that his indictment provides material for careful consideration and should not be treated lightly by the people whose verdict must be obeyed.

*Neeraj Prasad Ghosh*

## P r e f a c e

BURKE once said : "I have known merchants with sentiments and abilities of great statesmen with conception and character of pedlars." It is the misfortune of India that at the present moment it is being governed by people who masquerade as politicians and statesmen but are merely "merchants with conception and character of pedlars." This book is an attempt to place on record in bare outlines a short history of the socio-economic and econo-political activities of the first ruler of India during its post-British independence which is also the history of terrible gambling with the future of this country. The consistent inconsistency of this ruler who is lording it over the whole of India as a great dictator while crouching to certain political powers of the world in his so-called policy of appeasement, has not only converted the country into a dangerous state of political ferment but is driving it to veritable ruin and extinction.

The time has, therefore, come for the people of India to consider whether Pandit Nehru deserves to enjoy the high esteem in which they held him—their once beloved leader and further, whether the claim of the Prime Minister

to be a political heir of the Great Mahatma can be sustained. This is not a book intended for vilification of a person; for, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader, has been an idol of this author as he was of millions of people of India. This is merely an attempt for a dispassionate analysis of the activities of a Prime Minister who, in the opinion of a vast majority of Indian people, has been responsible for squandering an enormous amount of national wealth which was independent India's opening balance on the 14th of August, 1947; who has for the uncertain prospect of earning cheap popularity from certain foreign nations humiliated India and has sacrificed its prestige; who has betrayed the interests of India in the matter of partition and later on, in connection with the partition settlements with Pakistan; who has not hesitated to lick the hands of a country which has been responsible for rape and murder of hundreds and thousands of our kith and kin and finally, who has insulted three hundred million people of India by adumbrating that they have no culture.

In this booklet, I have tried to place before the whole of the people of India the case of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister, as I have found it. In my judgment it amounts

to an indictment of a Prime Minister for which he should be at the bar of public justice. It would be for the public of India who are his judges to adjudicate on the issues involved and to give a verdict thereon. It has become imperatively necessary to obtain such a verdict immediately ; because, in the opinion of the vast section of public which brings this indictment, the Prime Minister's indiscretion at every step, his folly at every issue, his extravagance in the Ministries under his direct control, his incoherence in foreign policy, his morbid infatuation for internationalism, and his cringing submission to insult and oppression has driven India from humiliation to despair, from despair to resentment and from resentment to fury--to the dangerous fury that we feel smothering every breath we seek to draw. Unless the public of India immediately adjudges the issues and brings a verdict in this matter, the storm which has been gathering force during the last two and half years may burst at any moment and if that calamity comes, not only the, chicken-hearted Foreign Ministers who act as dictators at home and merchant-politicians "with conception and character of pedlars" will be wiped out of existence but the country itself may be plunged into a chaos to the utter destruction of the future of our nation. This

is a calamity which must be arrested at any cost.

I am grateful to Sri Hemendra Prasad Ghose, the eminent journalist of the revolutionary era, for the keen interest he has taken in reading and revising the MS. and also in writing a foreword to this book. My thanks are due also to my esteemed friend Sri Moni Bagchee, Editor of the *Daily News Digest*, for seeing the book through the press.

DAILY NEWS DIGEST OFFICE,  
Calcutta, June, 1950

*The Author*

**G**ENTLEMEN of the Jury consisting of the people of India and their uprooted relations from East Bengal !

There stands before you in the dock of the public opinion a respectable gentleman with tilted nose and Gandhi-cap on his head. His name is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, son of the late Pandit Motilal Nehru and the supposed political heir of Mahatma Gandhi. He is the Prime Minister of the Republic of India and a member of the Working Committee of the All-India National Congress. His position in international politics is considered by him as very high. He stands before us today as an accused to answer the charges brought against him by his own countrymen.

*The  
Accused*



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Long before he came into power, Pandit Nehru was an idol of the nation for his service and sacrifice to the cause of our independence. But since he assumed power (as a gift, of course) he has become an altogether different man—a changeling so to say and he now talks quite differently. And that difference is so wide today that he is virtually separated from the common man for whom he has only lip-sympathy. Prime Minister Pandit Nehru, in the eyes of the Indians today, is no better than a powerful autocrat, almost a dictator, moving under the dictates of the foreign masters who have placed him in power. So, in accusing Pandit Nehru, I accuse the first Prime Minister of the Republic of India.

*Nehru,  
The  
European*

The Prime Minister is Indian by birth, but Gentlemen of the Jury, do you know that he considers that India is no more than a step-mother to him? In fact, in his mental make-up, he is more a European than an Indian. In culture, manner and etiquette he is a hybrid; a child of Western civilisation, a product of

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Harrow and Cambridge. He did not even know India and Indian culture till the other day when he “discovered” his motherland for the first time. The following few lines from his “*Discovery of India*” will fully bear me out : “... And yet I approached her (India) almost as an alien critic, full of dislike for the present as well as for many of the relics of the past that I saw. To some extent I came to her *via* the West and looked at her as a friendly Westerner might have done ... The present for me was an old mixture of medievalism and a somewhat superficial modernism of the middle classes. I was not an admirer of my own class or kind.”

Again, it is quite refreshing reading to be told by Nehru himself that even in his childhood he had developed an admiration for the English. “In my heart, I rather admired the English” (*Autobiography*). Mark the innocent looking word ‘rather’. This ‘rather’-attitude to life has never left Nehru. Rather, that is Nehru, if he is anything. He was born in a family where, to

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

paraphrase Nehru's own admission, an ever-increasing income brought many changes due to which "gradually our ways became Westernised." It will not be far from the truth to observe that this admiration for the English, ingrained in one's life since childhood, provides the positive side of his negative attitude towards his own culture and people. And that attitude has not left him even now. So, this is our Prime Minister—a European first and an Indian afterwards. You will have to consider the implication of this point when you declare your verdict. It would not be pious error, but mad and impious presumption, for any one to trust a man born in India but bred in European culture.

*Second  
World  
War*

And now I would like to acquaint you, Gentlemen of the Jury ! with some strange facts relating to the *locus standi* of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the Prime Minister of the Indian Republic. But before that let me relate a very interesting but tragic episode of recent Indian history.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

With the second World War the British sensed difficulty in retaining their former hold on India. The Indian National Army under the brilliant leadership of Netaji Subhas Chandra had made their position untenable—making their military prestige grovel in the mire. The British administrators in India held a census of the entire defence personnel of India whether the I. N. A. heroes should be prosecuted or not and about 80 per cent voted against prosecution. Then followed the Naval mutiny in Bombay and the revolt in the Indian Air Force, as also an anti-demonstration by Policemen in Delhi. The British, therefore, immediately decided to hand over the administration of the country to the Congress leaders, but only to those of their own choice and thereby made it certain that their trade may not be lost in any way whatever.

Do you know how the British chose administrators of their own choice for this country? How deep and unscrupulous is British diplomacy will be evident from an occurrence four years ago.

*The  
Malaya  
Episode*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

You will remember that about January and February, 1946, after Malaya was reconquered from the Japanese, the situation of Indian settlers there was very bad. There was great economic distress, bad health and almost all top-ranking Indians, patriotic in their heart of hearts, were charged with the offence of collaboration with the Japanese, treason etc., all carrying punishment with death.

The-then Government of India did everything for the Indians there by sending a medical mission and by sending lawyers to defend the Indians accused there, who were all released. None was hanged there at that time, like Mr. S. R. Ganapati in May, 1949. The-then Government of India also sent two non-officials of repute, to contact the Indians there, to observe the situation and make a report. In fact, when all this was done, there was no necessity of anybody else going to Malaya. We were, therefore, surprised when the-then Viceroy, the late Lord Wavell, casually mentioned to a Member of his Council that he was sending Pandit Nehru to Malaya.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

So Pandit Nehru was sent to Malaya on a short visit and at the same time secret instructions were despatched to Lord Louis Mountbatten, who was then the Supreme Commander of South-East Asia, to give a right royal reception to Pandit Nehru as the British had chosen him to be the future Prime Minister of India. Unless your memory is short, you will remember, Gentlemen of the Jury ! that the Indian Press was flooded at that time with photographs of Nehru's reception by the Mountbatten—photographs supplied by the propaganda department of the British. What other purpose could there be in this event except to establish a cordial friendship between Nehru and Mountbatten, who was to be the next Governor-General of India, and who was to suggest the scheme of dividing India and establishing Pakistan ? Can you imagine, Gentlemen of the Jury ! Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, a tried soldier and a trusted General of the Indian struggle for Independence during the Gandhian era, locked up in the tender

*Nehru  
Meets  
Mount-  
batten*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

embrace of the same Mountbatten whom Netaji —another tried soldier and a trusted General of the era—challenged on the battlefield of Imphal in his heroic attempt to liberate the country? Thus the lion was caged by the British and this proves that Nehru is no more than a circus lion! The high fire of patriotism that once burnt in his breast was thus extinguished for ever. Such things happen very rarely in history.

*The  
Great  
Conspi-  
racy*

Now, the Nehru-Mountbatten friendship played its full part in the future course of events. The negotiations for the amputations of India had to be carried on with somebody who could play in the hands of the British, and they wanted a “careerist,” i. e. a person who would go to any length if his pride and vanity were kept satisfied. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was the President of the Indian National Congress at the time but he was not prepared to take the odium of partitioning India. So, soon after Pandit Nehru’s return from Malaya, Maulana Azad obliged

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

the British and announced his decision to resign from the Presidentship, on grounds of 'bad health', which has not interfered in his carrying out the functions of the Education Minister of India ever since ! And, the need for the election of a new President in his place was made public. Two nominations were received for the post of the Congress Presidentship : Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel. The British knew well that if Sardar Patel became the President, he could not be toyed with. And so the Maulana came out with a public statement supporting the candidature of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, throwing all conventions to the four winds that the Congress President did not take sides in Presidential Election ! The result was, as you all know, that Sardar Patel had to withdraw from the field and on the unfortunate day on May 9, 1946, Pandit Nehru became the Congress President. The rest of the story is simple history easily told.

The Congress had already swept the polls early in 1946. So they had to form the Ministries.

*Interim  
Govt.*



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

The Cabinet Mission came and held talks regarding the future set-up of things with Pandit Nehru as the President of the Congress. The Cabinet Mission Plan of May 16, 1946, came within a week of the election of Pandit Nehru as the Congress President. Knowing full well how the mind of this leader, trained and brought up in British Universities, worked, they found no difficulty in getting their scheme supported by him. And the farce of getting the endorsement of the All-India Congress Committee to this *fait accompli* was gone through at Bombay in July 1946. The Congress decided to enter the Constituent Assembly. And after an exchange of some letters and talks, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was invited to form an interim Government. On August 24, at about midday, Pandit Nehru submitted the list of names of members of his Cabinet. But, hardly had eight hours elapsed when the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, made a startling broadcast proclaiming to the world on the radio at 8 P. M. : "Let me state clearly the offer which has been made, and is still

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

open, to the Muslim League. They can propose to me five names for place in the Government of 14, of which 6 will be nominees of Congress and three will be representatives of the minorities. Provided these names are acceptable to me and approved by His Majesty, they will be included in the Government, which will at once be reformed..."

Now there had been no such agreement between Pandit Nehru and Lord Wavell. If there had been any self-respecting person who had been offered to form the Government earlier in the day, unconditionally, he would have refused to form any Government in protest of this *volte face* on the part of the-then Viceroy. But, they had already got a safe man elected as the Congress President, and he swallowed the insult ; and diarchy started, leading to the present-day Partition of India. The rest of the history you know and I need not repeat the same to tax your time. To make the long story short, as a result of collaboration between Lord Mountbatten, Mr. Jinnah and

*June 3rd  
Plan*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Pandit Nehru, the disastrous Mountbatten Plan of partitioning India, dated June 3, 1947, was drawn up and carried through its extreme length with the results we see and feel today. And the most interesting part of the whole thing is that Lord Mountbatten was nominated as the first Governor-General of India, after the partition, by Pandit Nehru who thus repaid the friendly reception received at his hands in Malaya.

*Nehru,  
The  
Usurper*

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury ! I shall explain the *locus standi* of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the Prime Minister. As you know, on August 15, 1947, came the actual partition. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was not the Congress President at that time and as such he had no *locus standi*. But, the Congress Party in the Constituent Assembly of India, most of whose members were Pandit Nehru's elected nominees, was made to elect him as the Leader of the Party, though Acharya Kripalani, the-then Congress President ought to have been automatically elected as the Leader of the Congress Party. So, unelected by the people of

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

India as a whole, or even the Indian National Congress as such, Pandit Nehru was thrust upon this country as the first Prime Minister of Divided India, without any right or authority, simply because that fitted in with the British• Plan. Do you not, therefore, regard Pandit Nehru as a usurper to the throne of the Prime Minister of India by democratically unconstitutional means? I cannot contemplate such a thing were I placed in his position. History, from the date of Chingis Khan down to Hitler, has never witnessed such a strange case of usurpation. And, permit me to say, this was only possible by a sort of conspiracy which will certainly be recorded one day by the future historian of India.

Gentlemen of the Jury! You will excuse me for a few minutes if I digress from the main topic just to explain one of the fads of our Prime Minister. He has so many fads—internationalism secularism and modernism! Now what is this blessed secularism? Is India a secular State? In season and out of season we are told by

*Myth of  
Secula-  
rism*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

‘secular Pandits’ and ‘secular Maulanas’, the self-appointed administrators of the Indian Dominion that ours is a “Secular State” and public memory being short, and the press being practically a regimented press, our countrymen have also begun to believe that this is a fact. This costly joke played on the unsophisticated people of India has now gone on for too long a time and the time has come when the myth must be exploded for good. The reality is that this is only a myth and not a fact.

The Constitution of India, consisting as it does of no less than 395 articles and eight lengthy schedules, drawn up by a galaxy of 308 constitution-makers, all Congress men or Congress nominees out of whom hardly a dozen or two took part in the actual drawing up of the same, and which cost the Nation no less than 64 lakhs of rupees and took a few days less than three long years to be adopted, does not say anywhere in the 250 pages or more which it covers in print, that India is to be a “Secular State”.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

It might, however, be argued that though the constitution does not say in so many words, the idea is implied in what has been written in this longest constitution of the world. But this too is not a fact.

Our constitution-makers not only did not think it necessary to include such a specific mention of the words "Secular State" in the constitution, but actually refused to countenance the idea of this ancient land though mutilated being a "Secular State" in any shape or form. It was a Hindu State and it will ever remain a Hindu State, in spite of all the efforts of all our present day denationalised leaders including our Prime Minister, to ruin our ancient edifice. You will perhaps remember that Prof. K. T. Shah twice moved two amendments on this issue. In his second amendment to the Preamble in the Draft Constitution he wanted to add the word "Secular" between the words "Sovereign" and "Democratic Republic", but this was rejected by the Constituent

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Assembly. Then again, by amendment No. 96 Prof. K. T. Shah and Mr. Mohanlal Gautam, wanted Article I of the Draft Constitution running as "India shall be a Union of States" to be changed into "India shall be a Secular Federal, Socialist Union of States", but this amendment too was rejected. If our Constitution-makers had wanted our State to be secular, they would at once have adopted this amendment. But, being absolutely clear in their minds that this amendment would strike at the very root of everything that the majority of the people hold dear from times immemorial, they refused to countenance the idea of making this great land a slave to Mammon and so they did not accept this amendment.

Thus, we find that a vast majority of the '300 and odd Constitution-makers of this country refused to be party to this country being made a "Secular State" in any shape or form. In spite of all this, to assert *ad nauseum* today most shamefacedly that India is a

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

“Secular State” is not only a white lie but a fraud on the Constitution of this country and on the people inhabiting this great land. Then apart from this decision of the Constituent Assembly, you must consider the very fundamental question whether any state can be “secular” or “religious” or of any other colour at all ? A State means the whole body of people under the Government ; and how can the whole people be “secular” from their very birth ? The idea is simply absurd and meaningless. It is a monstrosity perpetrated on the people of the State. And one of the perpetrators of this monstrosity stands before you today facing this impeachment.

So, India is not a secular state ; it can, however, be said that the Government is secular and this is nothing more than one of the many policies pursued by a Government. For instance, the Nehru Government has a policy regarding Kashmir, that even though the precious inherent part of this country may



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

be lost to us for ever, the Prime Minister will not give up his fad of 'internationalism' and his belief in the good intentions of his Anglo-American friends in the U.N.O. Similarly, the Nehru Government has 'a policy that however treacherous a particular minority community may be, and however much unwanted and unwilling it may be to stay on in this country, this Government will keep such a minority here without caring for the consequence. Then, it has a policy that the British, who were till yesterday our bitterest enemies, have all at once become our best well-wishers. Similarly, the "secularism" is also a mere policy of the Nehru Government and it can be ended the day the Nehru Government is removed from the office. There is thus nothing sacrosanct about this secularism.

*Why this  
Impeach-  
ment ?*

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury, before proceeding with the impeachment, I must tell you that no consideration of etiquette should stand in the way of it. Etiquette, if I understand

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

rightly the term, which is of modern usage, had its original application to those ceremonial and formal observance practised at courts, which had been established by long usage, in order to preserve the sovereign power from the rude intrusion of licentious familiarity, as well as to preserve majesty itself from a disposition to consult its case at the expense of its dignity. The term came afterwards to have a greater latitude, and to be employed to signify certain formal methods used in the transactions between sovereign states. In the more limited as well as in the longer sense of the term, without knowing what the etiquette is, it is impossible to determine whether it is a vain and captious punctilio, or a form necessary to preserve decorum in character and order in this impeachment. I readily submit that nothing tends to facilitate the issue of all public transactions more than a disposition to waive all ceremony and concessions to the person of the Prime Minister now facing this impeachment. In this

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

but too serious business, it is not possible here to avoid a smile. Contempt is not a thing to be despised. It may be borne with a calm and stable mind, but no man by lifting his head high can pretend that he does not perceive the scorn that is poured down upon him from above. This impeachment, you will remember, is the inevitable consequence of the situation in which the Prime Minister has placed himself in ; a situation wherein circumstances would not permit us to retrace.

*India  
Divided*

To begin from the beginning. The Congress accepted the Mountbatten Plan. This Plan offered us freedom from British rule at the price of the division of India. The Congress leaders including the Prime Minister agreed to pay the price without consulting the people of India, and the British were bent upon extorting an unreasonable price for leaving India by creating for the Muslim League a Separate State. That was the first crime committed by the Prime

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Minister ; for, it was he who first accepted the sinister Plan offered to him by Lord Mountbatten. The British Government's Plan of June 3rd, 1947, seemed to some deluded Indians open a way out of the tangle of chaos and riot that had broken earlier in Calcutta, Noakhali, Bihar and then in the Punjab as the culmination of the cult of hate and violence preached by the Muslim League. Though the price demanded was the partition of India, the Congress suddenly agreed to pay the price in the hope that the Muslim League, having what it wanted, would cease to indulge in the orgy of communal hate, and the two dominions, freed from the incubus of foreign rule, would be able to turn their resources and their energy to the reconstruction of the social and economic structures of the two states. The other alternative before the nation was to withdraw from the Interim Government and to prepare for a final non-violent battle against the unholy combination of the British and the Muslim League. This was what Gandhiji wanted us to do, but the Congress

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

leadership headed by Pandit Nehru at that time found the prospect of an immediate and peaceful transfer of power too tempting and chose the first alternative.

So, India was divided in spite of Gandhiji's advice to the contrary; for he alone clearly realised that it was a wrong step which the Prime Minister and for that matter the Congress, had taken. Gandhiji stood alone, and desired to undertake a penance for the step which had already been. This was, however, not the case with his heir-apparent, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was then preparing for a full dress-rehearsal in the fashion of the Grand Moghul ! It passes our comprehension to understand how the Prime Minister who had his political baptism in the hands of Gandhiji could accept without the least hesitation the Mounbatten proposal !

*Punjab  
Blood-  
Bath*

So, India was divided. But hardly were our freedom-celebrations over when the Punjab was convulsed by an orgy of blood-lust such as India had not witnessed since the days of the wild

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

hordes of Chengiz Khan. Quetta and the Frontier followed suit. Countless men, women and children were massacred, millions were rendered homeless and property worth hundreds of crores was looted and destroyed by the Muslim vandals. Even Delhi witnessed a brief spell of communal hysteria. Thus the Muslim very aptly vindicated its faith in the two-nation theory by rendering a decent and self-respecting existence a mockery for the non-muslims in Pakistan.

While the country as a whole protested against this action of the Pakistan Government, our Prime Minister, however, took this ghastly tragedy very lightly. With Lord Mountbatten on his side, he could not and did not realise that the politics of the Muslim League and the principles which govern its policy in Pakistan are the very negation of all that the Congress has stood for. He naturally hesitated to take a firm stand. The ghost of Chamberlain over-shadowed him and lo ! the Prime Minister of India was bent on appeasement. There came the first Indo-Pak Pact and the two

*Era Of  
Pact*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Prime Ministers of the two States came out with a joint statement. The Prime Minister of India could not realise for a moment that the more we appease Pakistan's appetite the more it will devour till it becomes a menace to the peace of Asia.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! You know the results of this Pact and joint statement and I need not repeat the same. This is how the Prime Minister of India absolved himself of his responsibility towards the minorities in Pakistan. It is his weak-kneed policy of appeasement and submission that is ultimately responsible for this situation which is illogical and intolerable. It is due to his policy that today India is forced to maintain refugee camps in perpetuity. How long are the minorities in Pakistan to look for protection and shelter to the Government of India ?

*Kashmir  
Episode*

Then came the Kashmir issue. You will perhaps remember how our Government

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

declared its policy in clear terms regarding the States. You also know that Kashmir acceded to the Indian Union and the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government of India, pledged himself to meet any unwarranted interference or aggression from outside with all the resources at his command. Pakistan invaded Kashmir. The existence of this beautiful valley was jeopardised. She called for help. Sheikh Abdulla sent S.O.S. message to Pandit Nehru whose ancestral home was Kashmir.

Naturally the Prime Minister was moved and he ordered the Indian army to march. Everybody thought that our Prime Minister had risen to the height of the occasion, he had become firm and he could deal with Pakistan justly and sternly. Thus began the Kashmir episode. But when the victory was almost in sight, and the liquidation of the Pakistan-sponsored Azad Kashmir Government was almost a certainty, the Prime Minister ordered the Indian soldiers to lay down their



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

arms ! After months of heroic and expensive battles, the campaign came to a close all on a sudden, and much to the surprise and disappointment of the people of Kashmir and India. The inevitable and indispensable Mountbatten must have pulled the wires from behind and the Kashmir affair went straight into the blessed United Nations Organisations and it still remains there. The Prime Minister in his usual way came out with a statement to wash his hands off. Now, the fate of Kashmir hangs in the balance and the partition of Kashmir is almost a certainty. And when this partition comes, you will have the occasion to hear your Prime Minister again delivering a high flown speech similar to that of Churchill's Dunkirk speech.

### *Foreign Policy*

The Prime Minister, as you know, is also the Minister for External affairs, that is to say, he is the Foreign Minister of the Government of India and by virtue of this position Pandit Nehru is responsible for the

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

foreign policies of the Government of India. But, Gentlemen of the Jury! would you believe that his Foreign policy means a policy foreign to India? You will remember that the Foreign Minister answering in, 1949 to criticisms of the Government spreading Embassies all over the world told that independence consisted fundamentally and basically of Foreign relations. Nehru's foreign policy, therefore, meant crores of rupees belonging to the poor of poor India for ensuring the interests of rich India's rich—so that his friends and some relatives might roll in luxury in foreign countries. The Dominion Assembly voted to pass Rs. 2,59,40,000 for External Affairs and also Rs. 51,17,000 for expenses of the Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations. How many times did the Prime Minister declare at the top of his voice that "It will not be in the interests of India to engage herself in any pact which will automatically involve her in war," and

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

his declared policy of neutrality is no more than self-deception, pure and simple. And this self-deception ultimately led to the greatest betrayal yet perpetrated, in April, 1949.

### *Great Betrayal*

Gentlemen of the Jury! you may remember that an Empire Premiers' Conference was held in London in April, 1949 and Pandit Nehru was specially invited to attend that Conference. A fortnight before his departure for London the Prime Minister said : "It ought not to be difficult to fit a Republic into the framework of the Commonwealth," and immediately the people of India realised that he was going to commit India to the Commonwealth. India protested against this in vain. It is needless to say that the Prime Minister was encouraged in and assisted to his views by the opinions of the Mountbattens, Attlee and Edens. A Republic within the Commonwealth was a myth to all and the myth was exploded by General

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Smuts who said : "That an alloy of a Republic into the metal of a Commonwealth will violate every concept of the Commonwealth. There is no middle course between Crown and Republic, between in and out of the Commonwealth." Yet Pandit Nehru thought that it ought not to be difficult to fit a Republic into the framework of the Commonwealth and he discovered a formula by which the fitting would be easy !

This Commonwealth mania, I may be permitted to say, is the working of the British mind in the Indian body. Pandit Nehru's new formula for fitting the Republic of India into the framework of the British Commonwealth is a superb example of the loose and confused thinking that befogs the minds of many of the Congress leaders.

It is, indeed, a curious amalgum of the sublime and the ridiculous. While shaping the formula he forgot clearly that India's professed policy since 1947 has been one of complete neutrality.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Little did he or would he realise that the British wooing of the India was part of the master strategy to encompass the Indian ocean and the Pacific for the purposes of the Empire Defence Plan. His intimacy with Mountbatten and Attlee inspired the Prime Minister to maintain India's association with the Commonwealth and so he committed India to the British Commonwealth. Thus, he betrayed the four hundred millions of Indian people, betrayed the solemn trust reposed in him. Thus on the fateful midnight of April, 27, 1949, India was entrapped in the Commonwealth as a Republic with the British King as the "symbol of the free association," Thus he forged new fetters of slavery for us. Thus all the blood, tears, toil and sweat that India had shed through half a century of struggle for national independence, went in vain to satisfy the vanity of a man whom his country had taken in confidence. Who does not understand that the link with the Commonwealth is enough to compel India's automatic surrender to Britain's Imperialist designs

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

and her consequent entanglement in an unavoidable war ?

Gentlemen of the Jury ! this happened in 1949 due to the folly of one who had been quite a different man in 1929. Twenty years back, a 40-years old fire-eating thundering Nehru said in his presidential address in the Lahore session of the Congress (1929) : “The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom, but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally and spiritually. I believe, therefore, that India must sever the British connection and attain complete independence.” And the same man, after twenty years, while dining at the Buckingham Palace with the British King in April, 1949, declared that intimacy with the British Government was necessary for the Republic of India. Thus he betrayed in a most shameful manner the confidence of his countrymen and the masses who are the makers of history and makers of leaders.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Thus he defied the writing on the wall and the writer on the wall too will answer back in defiance of a lost leader. History has never had the occasion to witness such a betrayal and no amount of condemnation is enough for a betrayer. No wonder, therefore, that Truman and Attlee have found in him the best ally in resurgent Asia and it is not for nothing that he was invited to Washington and accorded a great reception there.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! you will recall what Churchill said in the British Parliament in November, 1942 : "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire." When he issued that famous declaration apropos India, how many of you could imagine that, that task of liquidation of free and independent India would be accomplished in April, 1949 by the first Prime Minister of India at London ? Does he not know that there is a British imperialist lexicon and in that lexicon Commonwealth membership means staying within the frame of British Empire for ever ?

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury ! a word about our Prime Minister's professed policy of 'neutrality.' As you know, Pandit Nehru prattles about 'neutrality'—to deceive the people and dull their vigilance against the plotters of war. But all this is hypocrisy — pure and simple. Let us see if Pandit Nehru's chatter stands the test of facts. On April 28, 1950, his Foreign Secretary Sir G. S. Bajpai told an American correspondent that "if the tension does not ease and if threats of another war come about, we recognise that despite our hopes, it will be difficult for us to keep out. We do not like to talk about which side we would come in, but I think the answer is evident to you." (*New York Times*, April 28 )

*Hoax of  
Neutrality*

And apart from this statement, the involvement of India in imperialism's war plans is, apparent from the frenzied diplomatic activity of the imperialists — activity in which so far as Asia is concerned, Pandit Nehru's India occupies a central place. India, at the instance of her



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Prime Minister, participated in the secret Conference on standardisation of arms, recently held in London — a Conference that was directed to fit all the armed forces of the British Commonwealth countries as suitable cogs in the American war-machine. It was at the suggestion of the Prime Minister of India that India's Commander-in-Chief spent a full month in London confabulating with the heads of the armed forces of the Commonwealth countries, presided over by British imperialism's top army boss, General Slim. India at the instance of her Prime Minister, also participated in the Bangkok Conference of the UNECAFE where Wall Street intends to push through plans to harness all the economies and resources of S. E. Asia to its war-machine. Again, with Pandit Nehru's help, the Gurkha soldiers of Nepal are being transported to Malaya to quell the liberation struggle of the Malayan people. The Prime Minister has given over a crore of rupees to Thakin Nu, British

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

puppet, to wage his war against the Burmese freedom movement. What is the meaning of 'neutrality' when every imperialist war is supported by Pandit Nehru, when every war conference is attended by his representative, when every single plan of theirs is approved, when every item asked for from India is readily given by her Prime Minister? It is, therefore, obvious that when Pandit Nehru says at the top of his voice that 'India is neutral'—he simply speaks a lie. This 'double-dealing' policy of the Prime Minister has reduced India to the position of a colonial slave—bound hand and foot at the mercy of Anglo-American imperialist and on every issue he must toe the imperialist line. This, then, is the true aspect of his 'neutrality' which has sunk so low that upsets one's stomach.

Then came the folly of devaluation. Britain, forced by Wall Street, decided to devalue her currency and the Nehru Government meekly followed suit. That the present disagreements

*Devaluation*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

between the two dominions arise mainly from economic factors should not be lost sight of. Devaluation was the proximate cause of the communal troubles in East Pakistan. They had their repercussions elsewhere. But meanwhile, the economic situation worsened steadily, at least in Eastern Pakistan. A climbdown being ruled out for reasons of prestige, compensation was sought in irrelevant directions with the tragic results you all know.

### *Mind and Face of Pakistan*

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury ! I am going to relate to you the East Bengal tragedy of 1950 for which the ultimate responsibility lies with our Prime Minister. But before that permit me to digress a little to acquaint you with the mind and face of Pakistan. The Pakistani mind is fed with the belief that India can be bluffed and hoodwinked. The Pakistani mind further believes that Indians are "soft", their leaders talk nothing but appeasement ; that they hardly retaliate, that they are not united. However unfortunate it may be, nevertheless, the Pakistani beliefs *vis-a-vis*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

India are more or less correct to a great extent. Have the Pakistanis not taken advantage of their reading about India and her people for long ? Even when extremes were reached, have we not been "soft and phlegmatic" ? Knowing as she does that India is "soft", her Prime Minister is "soft", Pakistan is going ahead with her plans with regard to India. Pakistan is full of evil designs and in this design, Pakistan, it should not surprise us, has found very good allies abroad, allies who even might fight their case at the U. N. O. Pakistani leaders were never satisfied with the land they got as a result of the Radcliffe Award. Whatever was given, they took sullenly. They are a very clever people and they kept mum for the duration. For the time being it seemed as if something nearest to peace had been established in this sub-continent. Pakistan gives the world a picture in which it looks that but for the problem of Kashmir everything would be all right in this sub-continent. But, Pakistan contends, "this Kashmir is a big thing. Without Kashmir

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Pakistan is meaningless." That propaganda is still on. The momentum has gained in propaganda behind the Kashmir campaign. But there is one more demand that has gained popularity in Pakistan. The demand is for West Bengal and Punjab (I). Remember Germany before Munich and also remember what Hitler said about Germany's demands in Europe before Munich and you will understand the way, the Pakistan Government is moving. After achievement of Pakistan, its army marched into Kashmir, played havoc all over. Pakistan wants to "possess" Kashmir, Punjab (I) and West Bengal must be 'possessed' by Pakistan. And as for Assam, the province would automatically walk into the Pakistan parlour. And this is the way Pakistan is moving. So in sober realism Pakistan is the child of aggression and violence. Pakistan is conceived through the hatred of Hindus and delivered through opposition to the Congress Party. She is thus hostile to Hindu India and to Congress India. A theocratic state cannot be otherwise. Pakistan makes no bone

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

about its appetite for India. It always talks in terms of sabre-rattling. There is no room for decent human life there.

*East  
Bengal  
Tragedy*

The East Bengal tragedy began to happen within the iron ring since the beginning of January, 1950. The Hindu minority there had to face a situation the like of which they had never known before. That grim story still remains practically undisclosed — only a part of it has so far been disclosed. What happened in East Bengal was organised political 'progrum', similar to those resorted to by the Nazis. Two aspects of the tragedy confirms this suspicion. In the first place the fact remains that throughout the State it was the minorities who were killed, it was their homes which were looted and burnt, it was their temples and other places of worship which were desecrated and plundered, it was their women who were abducted and ravished, and it was they who underwent threats of forcible conversion of extinction. Secondly, there

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

is no getting away from the fact that the lead was taken by official quarters which gave a free hand to armed miscreants of the majority community who held sway in different parts of East Bengal for a considerable period between February and March, completely dislocating the edifice of law and order in the province.

Then on March 3, the Indian Prime Minister, in a broadcast to the nation said with all his guts that the present situation in East Bengal "brooks no delay" and cannot be left as it is. Prior to that there was another statement made by the Prime Minister before the Parliament in which he said exactly in this vein ; "what has happened in Kashmir and what is happening in East Bengal are all inter-linked and we cannot separate them, and if present methods and proposal fail, we shall have to adopt other methods." This statement really encouraged the oppressed minority in East Bengal. Still then he had no definite action

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

in his mind. Twice he came to Calcutta to discuss the situation in all its aspects with all people. He came, he held discussions with officials and those who are *persona grata* with them without being sure to arrive at a decision. First he decided for a joint tour with Liaquat Ali Khan whose response to this suggestion was a blunt refusal. Then after one month he could persuade the Pakistani Minister for a personal meeting followed by joint declaration. That was how he wanted to solve the problem in the end proving thereby that essentially Pandit Nehru is a man of fiction and not of action.

So another Indo-Pakistan Agreement was added to the already too many of them entered into during the past 32 months between the two Governments, and we are asked to believe that although all the past pacts of a similar nature have proved to be nothing more than so many scraps of paper, this one will meet a better fate. But, it would be a

*Indo-Pak  
Agreement  
(1950  
Model)*



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

insult to intelligence to treat this new Agreement (which has, in fact, been described by Europeans as a command performance at the biddings of masters at Washington and London) as something having nothing whatever to do with previous pacts and agreements entered into by the same two gentlemen who have signed the present one and to treat it as something unknown in the short history of our independent existence.

### *Agony of Bengal*

Today Delhi has darkened Bengal's woe. And who does not know that Delhi has been the graveyard of empires? All signs indicate that the Indian Prime Minister is going to be the grave-digger of the empire founded by Lord Mountbatten in the year 1947 and handed over to the Congress leaders through Pandit Nehru. Dark and menacing days have descended upon Bengal. The free and unchecked run of most brutal barbarism in East Bengal, now forming part of a fanatic and reactionary theocratic State through

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

bungling, weakness and absence of grit on the part of the Prime Minister in whom the country and Bengal had reposed unquestioning confidence, and the grueling sufferings and degradation of 12 million Hindus —men, women and children, have created so intensely fearful a situation that Bengal today with all her culture, heritage and tradition stands staggered, stands on the verge of a pathetic and ignoble death —yes, death to all the high values of life, all the noble traditions of civilised existence that she, through decades of unrelenting devotion, had brought into being. Bengal strove and suffered, toiled and meditated throwing lustre upon the lost glory, upon the dim heritage of ancient Bharat. Bengal did and died with a dauntlessness and devotion unrivalled in the country so that India today finds herself an equal among the free nations of the world.

But that Bengal —that glorious Bengal —now gasps for breath. She lies in agony. With mortal

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

blows inflicted by communal vandalism on her, she cries for relief and succour. She cries for delivery of soul and body from inevitable death. In piteous wails she appealed to the Prime Minister, the Indian Government, to come to her rescue,—to come to the rescue of humanity, of civilisation and all that civilisation held sacred. She supplicated for aid, timely aid, to prevent her soul and all that it stood for was smothered by the deadly blow showered from the hand of the Communal vandal and assassin. But that appeal, that supplication has gone in vain. The mass murder of innocent and peace-loving men, the horrible butchering of children and the unmitigated bestiality of violating hundreds of helpless women have failed to warm the blood, that should have gone boiling within the veins of our Prime Minister. To save his face, to shirk the inescapable responsibility that he had invited for himself by ingloriously agreeing to the communal partition of the country and throwing thereby millions of Hindus, who had been as loyal and as honest

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

citizens of India as themselves, to the Pakistani marauders, our Prime Minister has contrived an agreement with the very authority under which unutterable atrocities on Hindus had repeatedly been perpetrated and is still being repeated. Too weak to stand erect in vindication of the nation's honour, Prime Minister Nehru has clasped the very hand which inflicted the wound to give protection to the wounded. Knowing fully well that this man, Liaquat Ali Khan is a real ogre and he is brimful of lies and bumptiousness, as he is an adept in the use of terminological inexactitudes, our Prime Minister has reposed his confidence on him. A more pathetic failure of the Indian leadership could not have been imagined.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! you will remember that our Prime Minister was bold enough to speak with dramatic force of "other methods" to deal with Pakistan's inhuman torture perpetrated on her minorities. Why did he not resort to his contemplated "other methods" ? Even if war

*Empty  
Threat !*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

with Pakistan were politically and morally justifiable, even if armed intervention by India for the protection of minorities in Pakistan were the only practical solution of an admittedly baffling problem, Pandit Nehru had no free hand in sponsoring measures of this kind. Let there be no mistake on one point and it is that unlike Gandhiji, Pandit Nehru is not a pacifist. His conduct of administration during the last three years has demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that contrary to his professed allegiance to Gandhiji, he has no scruple to use non-violence as an instrument for social or political healing. If India's Prime Minister has dismissed war with Pakistan as a piece of, to quote his own words, "fantastic nonsense," he has done so not because of his devotion to Gandhian principles but to avoid complications which Anglo-American strategy would not and could not face at the present moment.

*"Open  
Sesame"*

With a diabolical speed Pandit Nehru is rushing towards a position acutely dangerous for

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

his country and for the minorities in Pakistan. Through an uncommonly tedious and ridiculous process of change and counter-change the finalised protocol has received Indo-Pakistani authentication. Are we to believe that it will be an "open sesame" to inter-dominion harmony? Is it not in the light of past experience to be regarded as any more significant than a mere scrap of paper? The history of Pakistan is littered with broken pledges and promises unredeemed. Its very inauguration was signalled by solemn utterance only to be dishonoured immediately thereafter. Pakistani assurance of law and order could not check Punjab killings and could not prevent Punjab exodus of minorities from being carried out on the point of sword. During the West Punjab riots, two joint statements from Indian and Pakistani Prime Ministers, embodying terms similar to those stipulated in the present agreement failed singularly.

Gentlemen of the Jury! so this is the mind and 'face' of Pakistan. Not that our Prime

*Pakistan  
cannot be  
trusted*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Minister does not know this, yet curiously enough he wants us to trust Pakistan in the way he does. But can we really trust Pakistan?

If Pakistan were humane, she would not have allowed the transfrontier tribes passage to invade Kashmir and make a hell of the beautiful happy valley. If she were well-meaning, she would not have granted these merciless marauders bases in her own territory nor supplied them with arms and petrol and mechanical equipment. If she were honest, she would not have hidden the fact of this illegal entry from the world and admitted it only when the U. N. Commission discovered it. If she were straightforward, she would not have led India a dance on the Evacuee Property issue and at last closed it by removing it from governmental level. If she were co-operative, she would not have snapped her fingers in the face of our protest about the desecration of sacred places, the abduction

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

of women and forced conversions. If she were helpful, she would not, with the aim of incommoding Indian trade, have refused to devalue her rupee and to supply raw materials to India at agreed pre-devaluation prices even though India had not refused to buy Pakistan's jute as charged. If she were brotherly, she would not debar the Hindu minority within her borders from holding high posts in the Government service. If she were civilised, she would not have permitted nearly 5,000 Hindus to be massacred and many more mutilated — two and a half years after the partition fever. If she were not bent on exterminating the Hindus, there would have been no such incident as that at Kurmitola where the armed guards connived at wholesale butchery. If she were capable of conscience, she would not have refused Pandit Nehru's offer of a joint tour in the distressed areas or a joint fact-finding commission. If she could look the world in the face, she



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

would not have paralysed the press and clamped down an iron curtain for publishing reports that are based on unimpeachable evidence and inquiry

Does it not therefore follow that we cannot trust Pakistan? Let us not forget that Pakistan stands out as acting perfidiously and barbarously on set policy ; her very foundations are laid in communal hatred, religious bigotry, unscrupulous mendacity, delusions of grandeur, autocratic ambition. The opposite of liberty equality and fraternity holds good for Pakistan. Can Pandit Nehru's optimism avail against intolerant and aggressive Pakistani officialdom, (on whom rests the implementation of the terms of the Agreement), an established and organised machinery of falsehood, repression and genocide? The two-nation theory with its frenzy for Jihad is the very essence of the force that has brought about Pakistan and is the blood and bone of the Pakistani Government. Seen in its true inmost nature,

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

it disclosed itself as a minor avatar of the Hitlerite mind. This mind can never be changed by any Agreement based on Gandhian appeasement policy. The Prime Minister ought to have realised that the ideology of Pakistan's Government is such as to render those possessed by it incorrigible and that, short of internal breakdown, this Government is likely to yield to nothing except drastic measures. Pakistan is simply abusing the flush of power that goes with newly-won freedom and this fact should have been realised by Pandit Nehru before putting his signature on the Agreement.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement of 1950 is regarded by most people as an attempt to cheat history may be with the best of intention. It is, in fact, nothing but a revised version of the 1948-Agreement. The exchange of solemn assurances on the fundamental rights of the minorities in the two States is based on a truly extraordinary piece of make-believe, we mean, on the part of the Prime Minister of India.

*Policy of  
Appease-  
ment*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

The reference to the Objective Resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan in the present Agreement is a real triumph for the Pakistani Prime Minister and the most extraordinary thing is that in Pandit Nehru's eyes the distinction which only the other day he thought so fundamental should vanish altogether now. The Agreement along with the terms embodied in it is a monument of ideas to be reduced to meaningless nothings. There is a law of uniformity in Pakistan politics, and what has been the fate of the agreements, committees and commissions since the days of the partition, may be the fate of the present agreement, signalling the same cycle of unabashed recurrence. In, therefore, vowing solemnly by this agreement, Pandit Nehru has only furthered and finalised the policy of appeasement which has been his since the beginning of the East Bengal riots. Just as we cannot expect a cow to lay eggs, so it seems we cannot expect our Prime Minister to look after the interests of the mino-

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

rities properly. The Agreement, therefore, stands on false foundations.

Fallacy dogs the Agreement from the start to finish. Its many clauses and much vagueness say things that do not follow logically and leave much unsaid. Are we to build on the quick-sands of Mr. Liaquat Ali's assurance retold by Pandit Nehru, "that the Government of Pakistan believed in the modern conception of a democratic State?" It is the same Mr. Liaquat Ali who only the other day, to be precise on the 23rd February, 1950, declared in all solemnity: "We have decided to frame our constitution within the framework of Islam. The future of Islam was bound up with the future of Pakistan." So, in the absence of the guarantee of the fundamental rights, talk of assurance is meaningless and yet Pandit Nehru has made a pompous statement in the Parliament on this Pakistan brand assurance like a victorious Field Marshall! The Indian public and the minorities of East Bengal are, therefore, extremely disappointed at

*Death  
Warrant*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

the terms of the Agreement. They had expected much more from what Nehru advertised a few days prior to the Delhi Agreement. Barring these fundamental fallacies, there is a very complicated net-work of commissions and committees provided for ensuring and implementing several points of the agreement. Here also Pandit Nehru has refused to profit by the experience of non-implementation of the past agreements and breakdown of conciliatory machineries. Thus the 1950-Agreement sealed the doom of the East Bengal Hindus. The death-warrant of our own flesh and blood was signed cheerfully by the Prime Minister of India.

### *Violation of Right*

Gentlemen of the Jury ! as I have already established, the Prime Minister has no right to enter into an agreement on behalf of the thirty crores and more of the people of this unfortunate country, for he cannot be accepted as a legally and constitutionally elected Prime Minister of the Union of India, and as such the people cannot consider themselves to be bound by any of such

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

pacts and agreements. Coming to the actual agreement, I find some of its parts *ultra vires* of the Indian Constitution. As an example, I may cite clause 8 of the agreement which says "not to permit propaganda in either country directed against the territorial integrity of the other....." I am not quite sure as regards the exact meaning of the clause, but whatever that may mean, this clause is a direct violation of the Fundamental Right of Freedom of Expression granted to every Indian by the new Constitution.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! there is one more point I would like to acquaint you about the Pact. It has been noted by competent observers, Indian and foreign, that Pakistan leaders are playing for time. They expect to obtain relief from the economic crisis brought on by their own anti-Indian policies such as non-devaluation, non-fulfilment of trade agreements in regard to cotton and other items, economic boycott of Indian cloth, and so on. But the present jute agreement will enable them to obtain prices which amount to an accept-

*Economic  
Aspect of  
the Pact*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

ance of the Pakistan exchange ratio by India. The International bank will duly note this. And it will be surprising if our Prime Minister can refuse to recognise the consequence of his own action. It is not for nothing that Dr. Matthai is not there to explain the *volte face*. The Pact, therefore, amounts to a kind of economic disarmament in anticipation of relief in the political sphere. Our Prime Minister has already instructed his officers to exercise greater generosity in the matter of evacuee property administration. This means greater facilities for the removal of capital to Pakistan. Gentlemen of the Jury ! I therefore submit that if there is no meaning in the economic basis of national sovereignty, there was no point in pining for Swaraj. British rule could have continued. There was no point in exchanging Dalhousie and Curzon and their likes for Nehru and Patel and their brown prototypes.

*The  
Cabinet  
Crisis*

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury ! having shown the real character of this Agreement, I now

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

want to tell you that Nehru has sabotaged India's democracy in a most shameful manner. After all, it is an Agreement with a country, which, throughout a period of two and a half years of its independent existence, lost no opportunity, to use a mild term, to be unfriendly towards India. The Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement has led to resignations by three ministers from the Indian Cabinet. Now, India has a Constitution; she has a Constitutional Government; the President is the Head of the State; the Government is carried on by a Cabinet headed by a Premier, functioning on the basis of joint responsibility and owing responsibility to the Indian Parliament, to the Congress Party in the Parliament, to the Congress Working Committee and the Congress Parliamentary Board, the people of India, in whom the sovereignty of the State vests, are the masters.

Nehru is the Premier and the Minister for External Affairs. Sri Gopalaswamy Iyenger, Minister for Transport, has assisted the Premier



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

in regard to Indo-Pakistan relations. The invitation to Liaquat Ali Khan, the suggestion of joint declaration are Nehru's own policies, not of the Cabinet. We have the authentic report of Nehru's impertinent challenge to the Congress Party in the Parliament that he was the sole arbiter in the formulation of the Indo-Pakistan policy and that it is on that condition only that he will serve India as the Premier. Nehru has been careful to let the press emphasise that the Nehru-Liaquat Ali talks were conducted on a high personal level between the two Premiers. The Deputy Premier, Sardar Patel was excluded from the Nehru-Liaquat Ali talks and the country took notice of it and rumblings were heard in the country. It was only then that Liaquat Ali and Sardar met at all, for any talks. Later the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement was brought within the purview of the Sardar and Mr. Iyengar.

The Cabinet was excluded from playing an effective role in shaping the Agreement. The

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Congress Party was nowhere in the whole scene. Nehru did the Congress Working Committee the courtesy of sending a report on the 'Talks' and get it to sponsor a self-accusing, half-witted, wool-gathering, goody resolution. It is, therefore, clear that the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement is the expression of Nehru only. On the other hand, Gentlemen of the Jury ! you must know that the Agreement is a triumph of Pakistan diplomacy, in that it tars both the states with the same brush and puts India in the position of a Hindu State. It is by such tactics that the Muslim League under Jinnah's leadership reduced the Congress to the level of a Hindu organisation. Let me, therefore, remind our Prime Minister that the weakness of diplomacy is its blind and narrow outlook. Unless one can overcome this one cannot determine one's policy in the interest of the people he represents. Undoubtedly, too, the personal vanities and rivalries between Nehru and Liaquat have played an important role in determining

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

the terms of the Agreement which have, to say the least, shocked the people of India. Nehru is already having a hard time calming public opinion. He lacks the instinct for realising what the people are thinking. Pandit Nehru must consider that his decision involves not only his own career as a statesman, but India's history as a democratic country. The Cabinet Crisis is an alarm signal ; he must take note of it. He should further remember that no amount of glamour that may attach to a statesman makes him indispensable. It is my firm conviction that the Agreement is a premium upon fruitless appeasement and if the partition of India is a betrayal of the people of India, this scrap of paper so pompously declared as an Agreement, is certainly a greater betrayal of the people of Bengal.

*Anglo-  
American  
Policy*

The Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement has to be viewed in this context. Nehru's own statements on the East Bengal crisis declared unequivocally India's obligations and rights.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Nehru owed a duty, in this hour of National crisis, to act as a constitutional premier to maintain national unity, to lead an united cabinet, an united party, and an united Parliament. Today, we have a Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement, which, in the process of its making, has split the Cabinet, the Party, the Parliament and the Country. Is an agreement with Liaquat, more important than unity of one's own colleagues, co-workers and people? So, after committing the crime of partition, our Prime Minister is committing blunder after blunder now culminating in this heinous crime of sabotaging India's democracy. The Anglo-American Press applaud him as a great statesman. They cannot do otherwise; for after all, the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Agreement follows the pattern of reorientated Anglo-American policy in the South-East Asia which three years ago led to the transfer of political power on the basis of partition of India in accordance with the Muslim League resolution of 1940.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

### *The Pact And The Reality*

Let us now turn to the fruits of the Agreement. I am not going to refer to you the influx and efflux of the refugees. The Prime Minister cherished a very high hope of this Agreement and he thought that by this agreement he would be able to change the mind and face of Pakistan, and a lasting goodwill will follow. So he declared that "once the word of honour is given, it must be kept." Pandit Nehru is accustomed to cherish all such chimeras, but we are not. Indian opinion, however, had no illusions as to the ultimate result of this unhappy and unholy Agreement. Mr. Liaquat Ali's recent American speeches must have come to the Indian Premier as a rude shock. No ! a chameleon is a chameleon and a Muslim Leaguer is always a Muslim Leaguer and so a Liaquat Ali must remain a Liaquat Ali. He cannot be otherwise. That is not in his blood, nor in their Islamic culture as he understands it. Mr. Liaquat Ali's address to the U.S. Congress and his other public

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

utterances in America supply a curious commentary to the Delhi Agreement of 1950. To the U.S. Congress, the Pakistan Prime Minister spoke of Pakistan's origin in words that almost recalled the blood and thunder of the Direct Action Days of 1946. His one-sided reference to the influx of refugees was, however, the worst violation of the spirit of the Delhi agreement.

Gentlemen of the Jury! all this coming so soon after the Delhi agreement and from one of the signatories of the said agreement provides an ironic epilogue to the carnival of goodwill which we have called upon to celebrate. His friend's American speeches ought to cure the rose-water illusions about the lasting goodwill which Pandit Nehru seems still to entertain. How long will the Prime Minister remain busy chasing the phantom of goodwill which will never flow both ways? Pandit Nehru should take note of this trend of Pakistan's diplomacy in time ; otherwise

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

he may find that America has discovered Pakistan earlier than he could discover America.

### *Complete Failure*

The Agreement, Gentlemen of the Jury ! has completely failed so far as the achievement of its principal object is concerned. The principal object of the Agreement from standpoint of India was to enable the Hindus to stay in East Bengal, to revive their confidence towards that end. But there is no sign, even after the Agreement has worked for two months, that it has reinforced the Hindus' will to stay in East Bengal or that it is helping to revive their confidence. There has been no change in the basic situation in East Bengal due to the Agreement and there is no expectation either of such a change in the near future. So the urge for the exodus remains as strong and 'active as ever, and the refugee problem on this side becomes more and more intractable. As if this were not bad enough, the Prime Minister must add to the medley his own 'ostrichism' to make a perfect nightmare of it all. At his

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

monthly Press conference on May 22, 1950, Pandit Nehru referring to the working of the Agreement said that he could 'adopt a tone of restrained optimism.' This was vapid enough without the Prime Minister's adding, "There is no doubt that the mental climate on the whole is very good on both sides." A statement like this by the Prime Minister which is worse than a caricature of the real situation, is very dangerous indeed. Perhaps Pandit Nehru is anxious not to hurt Pakistani sensibilities but certainly he need not stretch politeness towards Pakistan to the point of confusing and even misleading his own people.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! I shall now explain to you another important aspect of this impeachment. That is the great bluff of "Planning" of which we hear every now and then from the Prime Minister. He is a great planner, no doubt ; but that is in a different sphere. But where the prosperity of the 300-millions of people of India is concerned,

*The Great  
Bluff*



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

the Prime Minister would have done well in not crossing the bounds of his limitations. But, no. Since he considers himself a man of super-genius type, planning must be his job, too. But does not the National Planning Body bid fair to become a costly futility? The Planning Commission, in the present state of economy, is simply unnecessary and wasteful, a factory for costly blue-print for castles in the air. Perhaps you remember what Dr. John Matthai (the former Finance Minister of the Nehru Cabinet) said in this connection. Let me quote his words to endorse my viewpoint :

“There are at present on the shelves of the various Ministries of Government plans costing nearly Rs. 3,000 crores, which have been held up for lack of finance, material and technical personnel. In my opinion what is required at present is first to draw up a strict order of priority for the existing plans...and secondly to work out the existing plans in detail at the technical end.”

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

The Planning Commission's sole contribution is the 'preconceived views' of its members, which make for argumentation and delay. Thus the one avowed object seems to convert the treasury into a huge public trough, from which the votaries of the Congress may feed. This is an election year, election campaign will cost Congress not less than 50 lakhs of rupees and the inexorable necessities of the Congress steam-roller seem to dominate the counsel of the Prime Minister. Many who thought that the much-publicised Planning Commission would be a spring-board are dismayed to see it converted into a shelf. Without setting up a powerful Ministry of Economic Affairs, with power and authority to go over all sectors of the national economy to tailor the programme to suit our finances, the Prime Minister offered us a Planning Commission. Dr. Matthai's incisive analysis of the situation makes this painful conclusion inevitable.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! allow me to digress for a little while just to discuss another important

*The State  
And  
Morality*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

point in this connection. You have, I believe, clearly understood what is Pakistan and what a pact with the Pakistani Government actually means for us. And yet our Prime Minister says that we should not be concerned with what the other side, i. e. Pakistan, does, but only with what we should do to fulfil the Pact from our side. He says this as the head of the administration and the Prime Minister of the State. And on behalf of the Government the principle of reciprocity has been time and again rejected in various other matters, such as the recovery of abducted women. To the apprehension that this policy or rather principle has been responsible for much loss and tribulation to India, the answer is made that observance of international morality and the fulfilment of Gandhian mandates are ends in themselves. This spirit, as you know, has made the Kashmir problem insoluble, for the Prime Minister refrained from pushing the raider and the Pakistani out of Kashmir on account of scruples regarding crossing the border. The

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

known fact that Pakistan had organised the whole war of raiders, irregulars and finally regulars was not regarded by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as sufficient justification for India to wage war on known international terms. So in the case of evacuee property. Reservation of Muslim evacuee property as a lien against Hindu property left behind in Pakistan in strict reciprocity has been regarded as below the level of the Nehruite morality, with the implied corollary that the whole nation should accept the consequences thereof without question and acknowledge it to be good in itself.

This situation, Gentlemen of the Jury! raises important ethical and philosophical issues of more than passing interest, issues that have been the subject of controversy in the history of philosophy and politics in East and West. One problem is how far the representatives of the State for the time being in charge should permit themselves to identify their own sense of morality with the good of the state. It is well-

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

known that there is difference between personal morality, or morality of relations among persons within the State and the morality ruling between States as sovereign entities. Diplomats are expected to observe the rules of truth, sincerity and other personal virtues in way different from the normal if their duty to the State demands such special procedure. Ambassadors are known to lie abroad for the benefit of their country. Of course the implication that they can be excused from morality is to take the joke too far. Obviously the same principle could be observed in different circumstances. Group morality seems to require rules different from individual morality. The representative of the State could be regarded as blameless personally if his departure from accepted codes was necessary in the interests of his country and was inevitable in the circumstances and was better than sticking to the usual procedure. But few thinkers could be brought to accept such performances as within the limit of the spirit of morality. Some ends may justify

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

some means but not all ends can be accepted as justifying all means. There are instances where the representative of the State acts on a level lower than personal morality but justifies it on the score of the good of the State.

But in India the situation is different. The representative of the State claims to guide the State on a level higher than current personal morality. The State owes a large sum of money to a hostile neighbour covertly engaged in war with it. The hostile neighbour is also a debtor on another count for a much larger sum, for the payment of which the first has given several years time out of overflowing friendliness. And our Prime Minister, as the representative of the State, preferred to follow the precepts of a 'higher' morality and pay the large amount with the full knowledge that it would make difficulties for the millions whose welfare he was charged with. The question of interest here is whether the conduct of the Prime Minister and for that matter, the Government of India, in this

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

case is really higher morality. The answer depends on a number of factors. It turns on the function of the State in history and society. In this case, however it is clear that the Prime Minister had no right to return Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan and it is also clear that his action was neither right nor good. So, this act of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru seems indistinguishable from inexcusable dereliction of duty. The claim to adherence to principle is irrelevant.

*Nehru  
Attacks  
Hindu  
Culture*

Gentlemen of the Jury ! this impeachment will be incomplete without any reference to the Prime Minister's slanderous attacks on our culture. You must not overlook this evil trait of his character. The Prime Minister has become conceited, vain and dogmatic. He has, of late, developed a peculiar habit of hating and attacking Indian culture. He does not know what he talks about or at least he thinks that all his countrymen are darned fools. His latest outburst on the sanctity of our culture is unpardonable. Recently on the occasion of inaugurating the first



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

convention of the United Nations Students' Association of India at New Delhi, the Prime Minister deplored the growing tendency among the youth of the country to be led away by slogans of Hindu culture. "These trends", he said, "are debasing, vulgar, narrow and egoistic." Hindu culture can thank itself that it has at least not produced an egoistic specimen like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

One fails to understand what he means to say. Does he mean to say that there is no such thing as Hindu culture? He must be blind. His concepts of religion and culture are rather vague or shallow. He may regard Hindu culture as anti-diluvian and outmoded; nevertheless the fact remains that India is India not for a Nehru but for her age-old culture. The Prime Minister may have risen to transcendental heights where religion and such vulgar things have no part to play, but his political father, of whom he claims to be the heir, never derided Hindu culture in the



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

most shameless manner as he has done. It is not difficult to understand the nonsensical implication of his utterance—but what pains us that our Prime Minister should utter such foolish words which would make even an idiot laugh. It is indeed incomprehensible as to why he does it. The only possible explanation is that power has completely intoxicated him and he is suffering from an extreme degree of self-delusion which makes him think that whatever he says will make sense. Gentlemen of the Jury! just try to realise the fact that the Indian culture-bater Nehru is far more dangerous than Nehru, the politician, for he is much too fond of the Western culture, far fonder than is compatible with the dignity of the Prime Minister of India.

As a fitting reply to this ridiculous utterance of the Prime Minister, let me quote the following lines from the pen of a high priest of Indian nationalism: “It was from the time

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

that India became apostate from the burning faith of God-consciousness and God-realisation that marked the India of the old that her evils and miseries began. And these evils can only end, if India recovers her ancient ideals, lives her ancient culture again. Cheap, shoddy imitation of the western modes of life and thought cannot recover the social evils of India, for it is the shallow, soulless mimicry that is responsible for them." (Pandit Shyam Sundar Chakravarty in his famous book, "*My Mother's Picture*"). Let the grotesque mind and the depraved intellect of Pandit Nehru reflect for a moment over these words and then he will certainly hesitate to speak like a megalomaniac.

There is another instance of betrayal on the part of the Prime Minister to which I must refer before I conclude this impeachment. The public conduct of Pandit Nehru since he became the Prime Minister is full of breaches of promise on so many occasions and the one I am going to relate crowns

*Promise  
of Interim  
Elections*

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

over all other breaches. When the Congress Party in West Bengal suffered a deplorable defeat at the South Calcutta by-election towards the end of 1949, the affairs in the West Bengal administration began to stink. The Prime Minister visited Bengal, surveyed the position personally and finally promised interim elections. And everybody thought that the Prime Minister means what he says. But no, he has a special knack of making promises without ever caring to keep them. He is a passed master in expressing 'regrets' whenever he fails to fulfil his pledges. To the lacerations of West Bengal, the statement of Prime Minister in January 1950, regretting the necessity to postpone the interim elections promised earlier was tantamount to rubbing salt into her torn and gaping wounds. The people of West Bengal pinned their faith on their Prime Minister to pull them out of the morass created by the self-indulgent Roy-Ministry and never was the hour more opportune for him to choose between the suffering of the people and the false

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

ideas of the party prestige. Gentlemen of the Jury ! as I have already said when the Prime Minister himself came to Bengal in December 1949 and testified personally to the suffering of the people, he gave them a categorical assurance that the only way to decide the will of the people was to inaugurate interim elections which he promised them in course of few months. He stood for the verdict of the people. But the promise given to the people of West Bengal was forgotten brazenly afterwards. What happened afterwards for the Prime Minister to go back on his plighted troth ? Was the decision against holding interim elections in Bengal his own ? Or else was he ducking under pressure —and pressure from whom ? Was he smothered by considerations of future of the Congress, more than the agony of the people of West Bengal ? This breach of faith added one more feather to his cap. But there is, as the Prime Minister will appreciate, disparity between the *promise* and its *fulfilment*. So this is Pandit Nehru—a bundle of inconsistencies !

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

*The  
Charges*

\* Gentlemen of the Jury ! one word more and I have done. I conclude the prosecution evidence by accusing the Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on so many charges—grave charges—stated above. I hope I have been able to lay before you all the major allegations levelled against him. The Prime Minister is quite at liberty to make such replies as he may wish in refutation of the charges against him. After you have summed up the evidence both for the prosecution and for the defence, you will be called upon to give your verdict. But one essential fact you will have to remember. He acts as if he were the Government himself and there were no other authority in the State capable of standing between the Prime Minister and the Government for the correction of mis-government. The Prime Minister has insulted the people by blaspheming their culture and betraying the confidence reposed in him; he has despised the ideals of democracy, violated justice, rejected the nation's demand as a powerful autocrat.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Power is sweet ; it is a drug, the desire for which increases with habit. That habit has gone too far with the Prime Minister to the detriment of the people of India as a whole and of the people of Bengal in particular.

Gentlemen of the Jury ! there stands before you a power-drunk usurper who has betrayed the vital national interests to the Anglo-American bloc and who has bartered away the cause of the Hindus in East Bengal to Pakistan where conditions, as you know, are not such as to allow them to live with self-respect. The Prime Minister's whims and fads have cost India in terms of crores of rupees without any benefit to her people. The charges are grave and the offence is too serious to be condoned. I, therefore, accuse the Prime Minister of India for his retrograde policies which • seem merely calculated to drag India further and further into misfortune and even violence. For too long a period the Prime Minister has been •basking in the warmth of popularity.

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Popularity jingles in his pockets. He thinks it easy money but actually that coin rings false and yet he cannot realise this ! He is a defunct and bankrupt politician, a chicken-hearted statesman who has always gambled with the destiny of the people of India. His appeasement policy have pushed a whole race towards destruction amidst inconceivable sufferings. He always confuses conscience with country. He cannot stand erect without the support of pacts at his left and right, as if he has no backbone ! He cannot chalk out an independent policy without the advice of the Mountbattens. What is more, the Prime Minister cannot face facts, cannot tolerate truth. Truth is to him what a red rag is to a bull and this is why he always shuns truth just as the Devil shuns Holy Water. But, Nehru or no Nehru, truth shall triumph. He is intolerant of all sorts of opposition and yet he says, "I want a strong opposition...I am not afraid of opposition." But does his mind ever reciprocate this ? No, a lie at the heart must belie the truth on the lip. The

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Prime Minister has not been able to resolve the problems of the country. Rather they have multiplied and intensified. The whole refugee problem is a glaring example. The refugee problem is one without a parallel in history. No greater calamity has ever fallen on innocent people. This calamity is man-made—that man stands before you—and not natural and being so, it is tragic and fatal. The Prime Minister's sympathy for the refugees is only lip-deep. His callous indifference to this problem is unpardonable.

His leadership is completely submerged under inanimate ideals and formulas of Truman and Attlee. And no wonder that in the international arena the Indian Prime Minister is honoured more as a circus clown than as a politician ! He is gambling terribly with the future, or perhaps the future is gambling with us. He is the latest to illustrate the melancholy truth of Action's dictum : power corrupts. The affairs of the State are considered no longer safe in his hands.



## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

Can the people of India further allow this eccentric, irresponsible man, this pseudo-democrat to hold the reins of the administration in this fashion of shame, defeat and dishonour ?

*The  
Verdict*

Gentlemen of the Jury ! the long and anxious impeachment in which we have been engaged is drawing to a close and it now becomes my duty to address you. History will bear me out that I am perfectly right in bringing this impeachment on behalf of the people of India. Here is your chance to do your part, a glorious part. Your country waits upon your verdict. The facts of the impeachment cannot be disputed. It has undoubtedly engaged your closest attention. You will not regret the strain that attention has placed upon you when it shortly becomes your task to weigh the evidence that has been put before you. You will govern your verdict accordingly. The sentence is not your concern; that lies with the court of humanity and justice. It is your duty and sole duty,

## THE GREAT IMPEACHMENT

to decide whether the Prime Minister is guilty of the charges brought against him. Gentlemen, first weigh in the scales the responsibility of the accused in criminal lapses and then you may consider your verdict. I ask you, in short, for that verdict of guilty which, in the circumstances, I regard you as, unfortunately, bound to record. I can almost read it in your eyes. THE PRIME MINISTER HAS BEEN FOUND GUILTY.











